



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/036,208

10/29/2001

Hiroyuki Odaka

087147-0602

4444

22428 7590 05/21/2008

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP  
SUITE 500  
3000 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

ANDERSON, JAMES D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1614

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/21/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|   |                                      |                                     |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Advisory Action</b><br><b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/036,208 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>ODAKA ET AL. |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b><br>JAMES D. ANDERSON | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1614             |  |

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 07 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☒ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 06 May 2008. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 4 and 25-27.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☒ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Ardin Marschel/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614

/James D Anderson/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1614

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments have been considered but they are not persuasive substantially for the same reasons set forth in the Office Action mailed 11/7/2007. Applicants have presented no new arguments in the response filed 4/7/2008. The Examiner maintains his position that WO 98/11884 teaches a method of administering a compound of Formula I (e.g., sibutramine) in combination with an insulin sensitizing agent (e.g., pioglitazone) to improve the weight and diabetic control of NIDDM patients (pages 12-13). R1 and R2 can only be H or Me and when R1 and R2 are Me, the compound is sibutramine as exemplified in the Examples of '884. With respect to pioglitazone, WO '884 teaches that pioglitazone is a preferable insulin sensitizing agent for use in combination with a compound of Formula I (e.g., sibutramine). Thus, one skilled in the art could clearly envisage combining sibutramine with pioglitazone to improve the weight and diabetic control of NIDDM patients. With respect to the claimed effect of "lowering the concentration of glycosylated hemoglobin" upon administration of sibutramine and pioglitazone, such an effect will necessarily result from a practice of the methods taught in WO '884 because the same compounds are being administered to patients "in need thereof" (i.e., NIDDM patients). It is well established in the art that NIDDM patients have increased levels of glycosylated hemoglobin as evidenced in Applicants disclosure.

With respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection over Grossman and Hauner in view of WO 93/03724, Applicants results are persuasive with respect to concomitant administration of 0.3 mg/kg/body weight/day pioglitazone hydrochloride and 0.3 mg/kg/body weight/day sibutramine. However, demonstration of unexpected results is not commensurate in scope with the claims. The claims encompass any effective amount of these compounds, separate administration, and pioglitazone or any salt thereof. However, the results demonstrated by Applicants relate only to concomitant administration of pioglitazone hydrochloride and sibutramine in specific doses.

Accordingly, the rejections set forth in the Final rejection mailed 11/7/2007 are maintained for the reasons of record and as discussed supra.